

Cycles for rational maps of good reduction outside a prescribed set

Jung Kyu CANCI

Abstract

Let K be a number field and S a fixed finite set of places of K containing all the archimedean ones. Let R_S be the ring of S -integers of K . In the present paper we study the cycles in $\mathbb{P}_1(K)$ for rational maps of degree ≥ 2 with good reduction outside S . We say that two ordered n -tuples $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ and $(Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_{n-1})$ of points of $\mathbb{P}_1(K)$ are equivalent if there exists an automorphism $A \in \mathrm{PGL}_2(R_S)$ such that $P_i = A(Q_i)$ for every index $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$. We prove that if we fix two points $P_0, P_1 \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$, then the number of inequivalent cycles for rational maps of degree ≥ 2 with good reduction outside S which admit P_0, P_1 as consecutive points is finite and depends only on S and K . We also prove that this result is in a sense best possible.

1 Introduction

Let K be a number field and R its ring of integers. Let $\Phi: \mathbb{P}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_1$ be a rational map defined over K by $\Phi([x : y]) = [F(x, y) : G(x, y)]$ where $F, G \in R[x, y]$ are homogeneous of the same degree with no common factor.

Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a prime ideal of R . Using the standard notation which will be introduced at the beginning of next section, we can assume that F, G have coefficients in $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ (the local ring of R at the prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$) and at least one coefficient belonging to $R_{\mathfrak{p}}^*$. In this way, let $K(\mathfrak{p}) = R/\mathfrak{p}$ be the residue field, we obtain the rational map defined over $K(\mathfrak{p})$

$$\tilde{\Phi}: \mathbb{P}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_1; \quad \tilde{\Phi}([x : y]) = [\tilde{F}(x, y) : \tilde{G}(x, y)]$$

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 11G99, 14E05

Key words: rational maps, rational cycles, S -unit equations, reduction modulo $\mathfrak{p}$

where $\tilde{F}, \tilde{G}$ are the polynomials obtained by reducing modulo $\mathfrak{p}$ the coefficients of F and G . Since the polynomial F, G have no common factors, the rational map $\tilde{\Phi}$ has degree equal to $\deg \Phi$ if and only if $\tilde{F}$ and $\tilde{G}$ do not have common roots in $\mathbb{P}_1(\overline{K(\mathfrak{p})})$, where $\overline{K(\mathfrak{p})}$ denotes the algebraic closure of $K(\mathfrak{p})$. If this is the case we will say that Φ has good reduction at the prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$.

A cycle of length n for a rational map Φ is a ordered n -tuple $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$, of distinct points of $\mathbb{P}_1(K)$, with the property that $\Phi(P_i) = P_{i+1}$ for every $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-2\}$ and such that $\Phi(P_{n-1}) = P_0$. It is easy to see that every n -tuple of distinct points is a cycle for a suitable rational map, but imposing some restrictions on the maps gives some considerable restrictions on the cycles. In the present paper we shall consider a number field K and a fixed finite set S of places containing the archimedean ones. We will study the cycles for rational maps that have good reduction at every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ whose associated $\mathfrak{p}$ -adic place does not belong to S and we will say that these maps *have good reduction outside S* .

Morton and Silverman [11, Corollary B] have proved that if Φ is a rational map of degree ≥ 2 which has bad reduction only at s prime ideals of K and $P \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$ is a periodic point with minimal period n , then the following inequality holds:

$$n \leq (12(s+2) \log(5(s+2)))^{4[K:\mathbb{Q}]}.$$

These results provide some bounds for the period-length of a periodic point for a rational map Φ depending only on the number of prime ideals of bad reduction. This generalizes and improves the result by Narkiewicz [13] who was concerned with polynomial maps, in fact if $\phi(z) \in K[z]$ is a polynomial, then the corresponding map $\phi: \mathbb{P}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_1$ has good reduction outside S if and only if ϕ has S -integral coefficients and its leading coefficient is a S -unit. For this type of polynomials, Narkiewicz found a bound for minimal period-length n which is possible to write in the following way: $n \leq C^{s^2+s[K:\mathbb{Q}]}$, where C is an absolute constant.

The main tool used by Narkiewicz is the finiteness of the solutions in S -units of the equation $u+v=1$, and in particular the estimate of Evertse [4]. On the other hand, Morton and Silverman used their results on multiplicity and reduction obtained in [12]. R. Benedetto has recently obtained a much stronger bound for polynomial maps. He proved in [1] that if $\phi \in K[z]$ is a polynomial of degree $d \geq 2$ which has bad reduction in s primes of K , then the number of preperiodic points of ϕ is at most $O(s \log s)$. The big- O constant is essentially $(d^2 - 2d + 2)/\log d$ for large s . Benedetto's proof relies on a detailed analysis of $\mathfrak{p}$ -adic Julia sets.

Let R_S be the ring of S -integers of K ; the automorphism-group $\text{PGL}_2(R_S)$ acts in a canonical way on $\mathbb{P}_1(K)$. If $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ is a n -cycle for a rational map

Φ , with good reduction outside S , then for every $A \in PGL_2(R_S)$ the *image- n -tuple* $(A(P_0), A(P_1), \dots, A(P_{n-1}))$ is a n -cycle for the rational map $A \circ \Phi \circ A^{-1}$, which still has good reduction outside S ; we will call the two n -tuples *equivalent*.

In [8, Theorem 1] Halter-Koch and Narkiewicz proved the finiteness of the set of possible normalized n -cycles in R_S for polynomial maps, where a cycle is called normalized when 0 and 1 are two consecutive elements of the n -tuple. In the present paper we generalize to rational maps this result, in particular we prove the following corollary as a consequence of our Theorem 1 below.

Corollary 1. *Let $P_0, P_1 \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$ be two fixed points. The number of inequivalent cycles for rational maps of degree ≥ 2 with good reduction outside S which admit P_0, P_1 as consecutive points is finite and depends only on S and K .*

Let $P_1 = [x_1 : y_1], P_2 = [x_2 : y_2] \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$ and $\mathfrak{p}$ a prime ideal of R . Using the notation of [12] we will denote by

$$\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_1, P_2) = v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1) - \min\{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_1), v_{\mathfrak{p}}(y_1)\} - \min\{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_2), v_{\mathfrak{p}}(y_2)\} \quad (1)$$

the $\mathfrak{p}$ -adic logarithmic distance; $\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_1, P_2)$ is independent of the choice of the homogeneous coordinates, i.e. it is well defined.

To every pair $P, Q \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$ we associate the ideal

$$\mathfrak{I}(P, Q) := \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \notin S} \mathfrak{p}^{\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P, Q)}.$$

It is characterized by the property that $P \equiv Q \pmod{\mathfrak{I}(P, Q)}$ and that for every ideal $\mathfrak{I}$ such that $P \equiv Q \pmod{\mathfrak{I}}$ one has $\mathfrak{I} \mid \mathfrak{I}(P, Q)$.

To every n -tuple $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ we can associate the $(n-1)$ -tuple of ideals $(\mathfrak{I}_1, \mathfrak{I}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{I}_{n-1})$ defined by

$$\mathfrak{I}_i := \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \notin S} \mathfrak{p}^{\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_0, P_i)} = \mathfrak{I}(P_0, P_i) \quad (2)$$

With the above notation we will prove the following results.

Theorem 1. *There exists a finite set $\mathbb{I}_S$ of ideals of R_S , depending only on S and K , with the following property: for every n -cycle $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$, for a rational map of degree ≥ 2 with good reduction outside S , let $(\mathfrak{I}_1, \mathfrak{I}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{I}_{n-1})$ be the associated $(n-1)$ -tuple of ideals; then*

$$\mathfrak{I}_i \mathfrak{I}_1^{-1} \in \mathbb{I}_S$$

for every index $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$.

Theorem 1 will be first proved with the particular condition that R_S is a P.I.D.. Afterwards the proof in the general case will follow.

The proof of Corollary 1 will be a direct consequence of Theorem 1 by applying the results obtained by Birch and Merriman in 1972 [3].

In the proof of Theorem 1 we will also prove

Corollary 2. *There exists a finite set $\mathcal{N}$ of n -tuples depending only on S and K , such that if Φ is a rational map of degree ≥ 2 with good reduction outside S , then every n -cycle for Φ in $\mathbb{P}_1(K)$ can be transformed by an automorphism in $\text{PGL}_2(K)$ into an n -tuple in $\mathcal{N}$.*

Two cycles $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ and $(y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1})$ for polynomial maps are called equivalent if and only if there exist an S -integer $a \in R_S$ and an S -unit $\epsilon \in R_S^*$ such that $y_i = a + \epsilon x_i$, for every index i . The definition of equivalent cycles for rational maps introduced above is the natural generalization of the one just stated.

Theorem 2 in [8] states that in R_S for every $n \geq 2$ there is just a finite number of inequivalent n -cycles for polynomial maps of degree ≥ 2 . This result cannot be extended to rational maps, since we have proved the following theorem in the case S contains the places which extend the 2-adic place of $\mathbb{Q}$.

Theorem 2. *Let $R_S = \mathbb{Z}[1/2]$. There exist infinitely many ideals $\mathfrak{S}$ for which there exists a 3-cycle (P_0, P_1, P_2) , for a suitable rational map of degree 4 with good reduction outside S , for which $\mathfrak{S}_1 = \mathfrak{S}$ holds, where $\mathfrak{S}_1$ is the ideal defined in (2).*

Theorem 2 proves that the conclusion of Theorem 1 is in a sense best-possible: for every cycle one has

$$(\mathfrak{S}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{S}_{n-1}) = \mathfrak{S}_1(R_S, \mathfrak{S}_2\mathfrak{S}_1^{-1}, \dots, \mathfrak{S}_{n-1}\mathfrak{S}_1^{-1})$$

where for the factor $(R_S, \mathfrak{S}_2\mathfrak{S}_1^{-1}, \dots, \mathfrak{S}_{n-1}\mathfrak{S}_1^{-1})$ there are only finitely many possibilities in view of Theorem 1, but not for the factor $\mathfrak{S}_1$, in view of Theorem 2.

Our method of proof is similar to the one used by W. Narkiewicz, F. Halter-Koch and T. Pezda (see [8], [13], [14], [15]). It provides an effective bound for the cardinality of $\mathbb{I}_S$ depending only on S . Unfortunately, by the same method, we cannot obtain an effective solution to the problem, since we shall use the theorem on the finiteness of solutions to equations in three S -units u_1, u_2, u_3 :

$$a_1u_1 + a_2u_2 + a_3u_3 = 1,$$

which is not effective.

Acknowledgments. The present work will be part of my Ph.D.-thesis supervised by professor P. Corvaja. I would like to thank him for his useful advice. I would like to thank also professor Narkiewicz who has sent me his fundamental articles concerning this topic. I am grateful to the referee for correcting some inaccuracies on a previous draft of the present paper and for suggesting substantial simplifications.

2 Good reduction for n -tuples

In all the present paper we will use the following notation:

- K a number field;
- R the ring of integers of K ;
- $\mathfrak{p}$ a prime ideal of R , $\mathfrak{p} \neq 0$;
- $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ the local ring of R at the prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$;
- $m_{\mathfrak{p}}$ the maximal ideal of $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ (which is principal);
- $K(\mathfrak{p}) = R/\mathfrak{p} \cong R_{\mathfrak{p}}/m_{\mathfrak{p}}$ the residue field of the prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$;
- $v_{\mathfrak{p}}$ the $\mathfrak{p}$ -adic valuation on R corresponding to the prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ (we always assume $v_{\mathfrak{p}}$ to be normalized so that $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(K^*) = \mathbb{Z}$);
- S a fixed finite set of places of K of cardinality s including all archimedean places.

We denote the ring of S -integers by

$$R_S := \{x \in K \mid v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) \geq 0 \text{ for every prime ideal } \mathfrak{p} \notin S\}$$

and the group of S -units by

$$R_S^* := \{x \in K^* \mid v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) = 0 \text{ for every prime ideal } \mathfrak{p} \notin S\}.$$

The canonical $(\text{mod } \mathfrak{p})$ -projection $\mathbb{P}_1(K) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_1(K(\mathfrak{p}))$ is defined in the following way: for every point $P \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$, choose some coordinates $P = [x : y]$ such that $x, y \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and they do not belong simultaneously to $m_{\mathfrak{p}}$, so the point $[x + m_{\mathfrak{p}} : y + m_{\mathfrak{p}}] \in \mathbb{P}_1(R_{\mathfrak{p}}/m_{\mathfrak{p}})$ is well defined. By the canonical isomorphism $R_{\mathfrak{p}}/m_{\mathfrak{p}} \cong K(\mathfrak{p})$, for every point $P \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$ it is possible to associate a point of $\mathbb{P}_1(K(\mathfrak{p}))$ which will be called the *reduction modulo $\mathfrak{p}$* of P .

Definition 1. Let $\mathfrak{p} \neq 0$ be a prime ideal of R . We say that a n -tuple $(P_0, \dots, P_{n-1})$ of elements of $\mathbb{P}_1(K)$ has good reduction at $\mathfrak{p}$ if the n -tuple formed by the reduction modulo $\mathfrak{p}$ has n distinct elements of $\mathbb{P}_1(K(\mathfrak{p}))$; a n -tuple has good reduction outside S if it has good reduction at every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \notin S$.

The finiteness of the class number of the ring R will be used to prove

Proposition 1. There exists a finite set S_R of non-archimedean places of K and an integer C , depending only on R , such that every point $P \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$ can be represented by integral homogeneous coordinates (x, y) satisfying $\min\{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x), v_{\mathfrak{p}}(y)\} = 0$ for all prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \notin S_R$ and $\min\{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x), v_{\mathfrak{p}}(y)\} \leq C$ for every $\mathfrak{p} \in S_R$.

Proof. Let $R, (a_2R + b_2R), \dots, (a_tR + b_tR)$ be a set of representatives for the ideal classes. Each point $P \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$ can be expressed by integer coordinates $P = [x : y]$ such that $(xR + yR) = (a_iR + b_iR)$ for a suitable index $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ (with $a_1 = b_1 = 1$), thus

$$\min\{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x), v_{\mathfrak{p}}(y)\} = \min\{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(a_i), v_{\mathfrak{p}}(b_i)\}$$

for every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$.

Now it is sufficient to choose S_R as the set of non-archimedean places such that $\min\{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(a_i), v_{\mathfrak{p}}(b_i)\} \neq 0$ for some index $i \in \{2, \dots, t\}$ and

$$C = \max_{\mathfrak{p} \in S_R} \{\min\{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(a_i), v_{\mathfrak{p}}(b_i)\} \mid i \in \{2, \dots, t\}\}. \quad (3)$$

The constant C and the set S_R can be taken depending only on K since [10, Corollary 2 to Theorem 36, Chapter 5] $\square$

Proposition 1 allows to adopt the following convention: writing $P = [x : y]$ for a generic element of $\mathbb{P}_1(K)$ we will always choose $x, y \in R$ with the property just described and we will say that x and y are *almost coprime*.

Notation. In the present section every point will be represented with almost coprime coordinates, except in the cases in which it will be explicitly specified. Moreover for any n -tuple $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ of points of $\mathbb{P}_1(K)$, for every index i , (x_i, y_i) always will represent almost coprime integral homogeneous coordinate for the point P_i .

The $\mathfrak{p}$ -adic logarithmic distance $\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}$ defined in (1) assumes integral values and the following properties hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P, Q) &\geq 0 && \text{for every } P \text{ and } Q && (\delta') \\ \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P, Q) &\geq 1 && \text{if and only if } P \equiv Q \pmod{\mathfrak{p}} && (\delta'') \\ \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P, Q) &= \infty && \text{if and only if } P = Q && (\delta''') \end{aligned}$$

By property (δ'') it follows that a n -tuple $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{P}_1^n(K)$ has good reduction outside S if and only if $\delta_p(P_i, P_j) = 0$ for every prime ideal p not in S and for every distinct indexes $i, j \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$.

Therefore if the n -tuple $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ has good reduction outside S , then the $(n-1)$ -tuple $(\mathfrak{S}_1, \mathfrak{S}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{S}_{n-1})$ of ideals defined by (2) is equal to $(R_S, \dots, R_S)$.

Definition 2. Two n -tuples $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ and $(Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_{n-1})$ are called equivalent if there exists a projective automorphism $A \in \text{PGL}_2(R_S)$ such that

$$A(P_i) = Q_i \text{ for all } i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}.$$

If the n -tuples $(P_0, \dots, P_{n-1})$ and $(Q_0, \dots, Q_{n-1})$ are equivalent, then the $(n-1)$ -tuples $(\mathfrak{S}_1, \mathfrak{S}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{S}_{n-1})$ of ideals defined by (2) coincide. Moreover if a n -tuple $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ has good reduction outside S , then every n -tuple equivalent to $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ has good reduction outside S as well.

If R_S is a P.I.D. (principal ideal domain), then the class number of R_S is 1 and R_S is a representative of the unique ideal class. In this case, for any point of $\mathbb{P}_1(K)$ we can choose coprime integral homogeneous coordinates and then, from this choice, for any n -tuple $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ with good reduction outside S and for every prime ideal $p \notin S$ it follows that

$$v_p(x_i y_j - x_j y_i) = \delta_p(P_i, P_j) = 0$$

thus $x_i y_j - x_j y_i$ is a S -unit.

In general R_S is not always a P.I.D.. Enlarging S (to obtain a principal domain) we change the equivalence relation between n -tuples. So we can not change S since we investigate about finiteness of the orbits of n -tuples under the action of $\text{PGL}_2(R_S)$. But in any case we have that

Lemma 1. *There exists a finite set $\mathcal{R}$ of S -integers depending only on S and K such that for any n -tuple $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ of good reduction outside S and for every distinct indexes $i, j \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ there exist $r_{i,j} \in \mathcal{R}$ and a unit $u_{i,j} \in R_S^*$ such that*

$$x_i y_j - x_j y_i = r_{i,j} u_{i,j}.$$

Proof. By the good reduction of $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ and the definition of logarithmic distance we have that

$$v_p(x_i y_j - x_j y_i) = \min\{v_p(x_i), v_p(y_i)\} + \min\{v_p(x_j), v_p(y_j)\}$$

for every $\mathfrak{p} \notin S$. Let C be the integer and S_R the set defined in the Proposition 1. Having chosen almost coprime coordinates it follows that

$$v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_i y_j - x_j y_i) \leq 2C, \quad (4)$$

for every $\mathfrak{p} \in S_R/S$, and $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_i y_j - x_j y_i) = 0$ for every other prime ideal not in S . For every couple of distinct points $P_i = [x_i : y_i], P_j = [x_j : y_j]$ included in a n -tuple which has good reduction outside S , it is defined the following principal ideal of R_S

$$(x_i y_j - x_j y_i) R_S = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in S_R \setminus S} \mathfrak{p}^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_i y_j - x_j y_i)}.$$

By (4) we are in the position to conclude that the set of principal ideals generated in this way has finite cardinality and therefore choosing a generator for every ideal defines the finite set $\mathcal{R}$ which has cardinality bounded by $(2C + 1)^{|S_R \setminus S|}$. By the remarks made at the end of the proof of Proposition 1 we deduce that the cardinality of $\mathcal{R}$ is bounded by a constant which depends only on S and K . $\square$

By the finiteness of classes of binary forms with given discriminant proved by Birch and Merriman in 1972 [3] we deduce the following

Proposition 2. *The set of equivalence classes of n -tuples with good reduction outside S is finite and depends only on the set S and K .*

Proof. Note first that for large n there are no n -tuples with good reduction outside S . Indeed, let $m = \min_{\mathfrak{p} \notin S} \{|K(\mathfrak{p})|\}$. For every $n \geq m + 2$, each n -tuple will not be of good reduction outside S , since for every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ which realizes the minimum m the projective space $\mathbb{P}_1(K(\mathfrak{p}))$ has only $m + 1$ elements.

For $n = 1$ the number of equivalence classes is the order of the ideal class group. Indeed, let r be the class number of R_S . We choose the representatives for every class and express them, except the trivial ideal R_S , through two generators $(a_2 R_S + b_2 R_S), \dots, (a_r R_S + b_r R_S)$. Note that these representatives define r points of $\mathbb{P}_1(K)$ inequivalent for the action of $\mathrm{PGL}_2(R_S)$. Now we prove that every point $P \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$ belongs to the orbit of $[1:0]$ or of a point $[a_i : b_i]$ for a suitable index $i \in \{2, \dots, r\}$. Let $P \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$. We write it with integer coordinates $P = [\bar{x} : \bar{y}]$.

If $(\bar{x} R_S + \bar{y} R_S)$ is a principal ideal (i.e. it is equivalent to the trivial ideal R_S), then P is an element of the orbit of $[1 : 0]$ under the action of $\mathrm{PGL}_2(R_S)$. Indeed, let $(\bar{x} R_S + \bar{y} R_S) = a R_S$ for a suitable $a \in R_S$; then $x = \bar{x}/a$ and $y = \bar{y}/a$ are elements of R_S such that $(x R_S + y R_S) = R_S$; this is equivalent to the existence of two S -integers r_x and r_y such that $x r_x + y r_y = 1$; therefore the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} r_x & r_y \\ -y & x \end{pmatrix}$ belongs to $\mathrm{SL}_2(R_S)$

and maps the point $[x : y]$ to $[1 : 0]$.

Otherwise, there exist $c, d \in R_S$ such that $c(\bar{x}R_S + \bar{y}R_S) = d(a_iR_S + b_iR_S)$ for some index i ; therefore, denoting $x = c\bar{x}/d$ and $y = c\bar{y}/d$ (elements of R_S), the following holds

$$(xR_S + yR_S) = (a_iR_S + b_iR_S) = I \subset R_S.$$

By definition of I^{-1} , there are elements $x', y' \in I^{-1}$ satisfying $xy' - yx' = 1$, namely $\begin{pmatrix} x & x' \\ y & y' \end{pmatrix} \in \text{SL}_2(K)$. Moreover there are $a'_i, b'_i \in I^{-1}$ such that $a_ib'_i - b_ia'_i = 1$, namely $\begin{pmatrix} a_i & a'_i \\ b_i & b'_i \end{pmatrix} \in \text{SL}_2(K)$. So that the following matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_i & a'_i \\ b_i & b'_i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x & x' \\ y & y' \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} a_i & a'_i \\ b_i & b'_i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} y' & -x' \\ -y & x \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_iy' - ya'_i & -a_ix' + xa'_i \\ y'b_i - yb'_i & -x'b_i + xb'_i \end{pmatrix} \in \text{SL}_2(R_S)$$

maps $[x : y]$ to $[a_i : b_i]$. This concludes the case $n = 1$.

Let $n \geq 2$ and $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ be a n -tuple with good reduction outside S . By Lemma 1 we obtain for every distinct indexes i, j the following identity

$$x_i y_j - x_j y_i = r_{i,j} u_{i,j}, \quad (5)$$

where $u_{i,j} \in R_S^*$ and $r_{i,j} \in \mathcal{R}$. For every choice of a unit $\lambda \in R_S^*$, these identities are verified also after replacing the almost coprime coordinates $[x_i : y_i]$ with the coordinates $[\lambda x_i : \lambda y_i]$. Now fixing the possible values of $r_{i,j}$, to every n -tuple of points which verifies the identities (5) we associate the following binary form of degree n

$$F(X, Y) = \prod_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} (x_i X - y_i Y),$$

defining in this way a family of forms with discriminant

$$D(F) = u \left(\prod_{0 \leq i < j \leq n-1} r_{i,j}^2 \right), \quad (6)$$

where u is a S -unit.

The multiplicative group R_S^* is finitely generated, so there exists a finite set $\mathcal{V} \subset R_S^*$ such that every S -unit is representable as product of a $(2n - 2)$ -power of an S -unit and an element of $\mathcal{V}$. Then, for every n -tuple $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ with good reduction which satisfies the identities (5), the unit u which appears in the equation (6) relative to the discriminant of the binary form associated to

$(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ can be written as $u = v\lambda^{2n-2}$ with $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\lambda \in R_S^*$. Thus, if we replace the coordinates (x_0, y_0) of P_0 with $(x_0\lambda^{-1}, y_0\lambda^{-1})$, we obtain a new binary form with discriminant $v \prod r_{i,j}^2$.

In other words, with an appropriate choice of coordinates, the n -tuples which satisfy the identities (5) with fixed $r_{i,j}$ define a family of binary forms of degree n whose discriminant is of the form $v \prod r_{i,j}^2$ with $v \in \mathcal{V}$.

Two binary forms $G(X, Y)$ and $H(X, Y)$ are called equivalent if there exists a matrix $A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \text{GL}_2(R_S)$ such that $G(X, Y) = H(aX+bY, cX+dY)$. The equivalence of binary forms associated with n -tuples coincide with the equivalence of the corresponding unordered n -tuples. By the results obtained by Birch and Meriman in 1972 [3] (non effective) and Evertse and Győry in 1991 [6] (effective) we know that the number of classes of binary forms of degree n with fixed discriminant $v \prod r_{i,j}^2$ is finite and bounded by an integer depending only on S . Since the cardinalities of the sets $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{V}$ are finite and depend only on S and K , then the set of classes of n -tuples with good reduction outside S has finite cardinality depending only on S and K .

□

3 Cycles for rational maps

Let $\Phi: \mathbb{P}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_1$ a rational map defined over K by $\Phi([x : y]) = [F(x, y) : G(x, y)]$, where $F, G \in R[x, y]$ have no common factor and are homogeneous of the same degree.

Definition 3. We say that a morphism $\Phi: \mathbb{P}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_1$ defined over K has good reduction at a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ if there exists a morphism $\tilde{\Phi}: \mathbb{P}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_1$ defined over $K(\mathfrak{p})$ with $\deg \Phi = \deg \tilde{\Phi}$ such that the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{P}_{1,K} & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & \mathbb{P}_{1,K} \\ \sim \downarrow & & \downarrow \sim \\ \mathbb{P}_{1,K(\mathfrak{p})} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\Phi}} & \mathbb{P}_{1,K(\mathfrak{p})} \end{array}$$

is commutative, where $\sim$ denotes the reduction modulo $\mathfrak{p}$. Furthermore if Φ has good reduction at every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \notin S$, we say that it has good reduction outside S .

We may assume that F, G have coefficients in $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and that at least one coefficient is in $R_{\mathfrak{p}}^*$; therefore we obtain a rational map, defined over $K(\mathfrak{p})$, as follows

$$\tilde{\Phi}: \mathbb{P}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_1; \quad \tilde{\Phi}([x : y]) = [\tilde{F}(x, y) : \tilde{G}(x, y)],$$

where $\tilde{F}, \tilde{G}$ are the polynomials obtained by reduction modulo $\mathfrak{p}$ of the coefficients of F and G . This is the rational map which appears in the Definition 3. Hence the rational map Φ , with its coefficients chosen as described above, has good reduction at the prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ if and only if $\text{Res}(\tilde{F}, \tilde{G})$ is non zero (since F and G have no common factors).

If $H(t_1, \dots, t_k) \in K[t_1, \dots, t_k]$ is a non zero polynomial, following the notation of [12], we define $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(H)$ as

$$v_{\mathfrak{p}}(H) = v_{\mathfrak{p}}\left(\sum_I a_I t_1^{i_1} \cdots t_k^{i_k}\right) = \min_I v_{\mathfrak{p}}(a_I)$$

where the minimum is taken over all multi-indexes $I = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$. That is, $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(H)$ is the smallest valuation of the coefficients of H . For any family of polynomials $H_1, \dots, H_m \in K[t_1, \dots, t_k]$ we define $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(H_1, \dots, H_m)$ to be the minimum of the $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(H_i)$, $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.

Let Φ be defined as above and let $\text{Res}(F, G)$ be the resultant of homogeneous polynomials F and G of degree d . We define $\text{Disc}(\Phi)$ to be the integral ideal of R whose valuation at the prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ is given by

$$v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\text{Disc}(\Phi)) = v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\text{Res}(F, G)) - 2dv_{\mathfrak{p}}(F, G).$$

The definition is a good one by the properties of the resultant. Moreover choosing the coordinates of F, G in $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and such that at least one coefficient is in $R_{\mathfrak{p}}^*$, we obtain that $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\text{Disc}(\Phi)) = v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\text{Res}(F, G))$. Therefore Φ has good reduction at the prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ if and only if $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\text{Disc}(\Phi)) = 0$. We will consider only cycles for rational maps which have good reduction outside S and of degree ≥ 2 . These maps form a semigroup under composition on which the group $\text{PGL}_2(R_S)$ acts by conjugation.

Definition 4. *An ordered n -tuple of elements of $\mathbb{P}_1(K)$ which is a cycle for a rational map with good reduction outside S will be called a (S, n) -cycle.*

We will use the following elementary proposition included in the paper by Morton and Silverman [12, Proposition 6.1].

Proposition 3. *Let $\Phi: \mathbb{P}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_1$ be a rational map over K which has good reduction at the prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ and let $P \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$ be a periodic point for Φ with minimal period n . Then*

$$(a) \quad \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\Phi^i(P), \Phi^j(P)) = \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\Phi^{i+k}(P), \Phi^{j+k}(P)) \text{ for every } i, j, k \in \mathbb{Z}$$

$$(b) \text{ Let } i, j \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } \gcd(i - j, n) = 1. \text{ Then}$$

$$\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\Phi^i(P), \Phi^j(P)) = \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\Phi(P), P).$$

□

This proposition states that, for every indices i, k , the ideals $\mathfrak{I}(P_0, P_i)$ and $\mathfrak{I}(P_k, P_{k+i})$ defined in (2) are equal. Moreover if k and n are coprime, then the ideals $\mathfrak{I}(P_0, P_k)$ and $\mathfrak{I}(P_0, P_1)$ are equal.

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1 in the case that R_S is a P.I.D..

Since we want to obtain a finiteness result about rational maps with good reduction outside S , without loss of generality in this section we can suppose that R_S is a P.I.D.. Indeed each rational map which has good reduction outside S has good reduction outside every set of places which contains S ; hence we can enlarge S so that R_S becomes a P.I.D.. Note that the cardinality of a minimum enlarged set, with the above property, is bounded by $s + h_{R_S} - 1$, where h_{R_S} is the class number of R_S . In fact: if all prime ideal are principal, then R_S is a P.I.D.; otherwise such a prime ideal is contained in an ideal class which is not the trivial one, so if we add this prime ideal to S (obtaining a larger set S') we have that the new ring $R_{S'}$ has class number $h_{R_{S'}} < h_{R_S}$; by inductive method it results that to obtain a P.I.D. it suffices to add to S a number of prime ideals $\leq h_{R_S} - 1$.

In all part of this subsection we suppose that R_S is a principal domain so we can adopt the convention that any point $P_i \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$ will be represented by coprime S -integral homogeneous coordinates $[x_i : y_i]$. By this convention for all prime ideals $\mathfrak{p} \notin S$ and every points $P_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$ it follows that $\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_1, P_2) = v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1)$. The next lemma states part (a) of the last proposition in a form which will be useful in the sequel:

Lemma 2. *For every (S, n) -cycle $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ and for every $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ there exist an S -unit $u_{j,j+i} \in R_S^*$ such that*

$$(x_j y_{j+i} - x_{j+i} y_j) = (x_0 y_i - x_i y_0) u_{j,j+i}. \quad (7)$$

Proof. Proposition 3 asserts that, for every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \notin S$ and for every couple of indexes $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have that $\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_j, P_{j+i}) = \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_0, P_i)$, therefore the identity $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_j y_{j+i} - x_{j+i} y_j) = v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0 y_j - x_j y_0)$ holds. So we have

$$u_{j,j+i} = \frac{x_j y_{j+i} - x_{j+i} y_j}{x_0 y_i - x_i y_0} \in R_S^*.$$

□

Another simple but important fact is the following:

Lemma 3. *For every (S, n) -cycle $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ and for every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \notin S$ the following properties hold:*

1. *for all indexes $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$, $i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ we have $\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_j, P_{j+i}) \geq \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_0, P_1)$, or equivalently*

$$C_i := \frac{x_0 y_i - x_i y_0}{x_0 y_1 - x_1 y_0} \in R_S \quad (8)$$

and

$$x_j y_{j+i} - x_{j+i} y_j = C_i u_{j,j+i} (x_0 y_1 - x_1 y_0), \quad (9)$$

where $u_{j,j+i} \in R_S^*$.

2. *let $P_0 = [x_0 : y_0]$ and $P_1 = [x_1 : y_1]$ be the first and the second point of the (S, n) -cycle. The matrix $A \in \text{GL}_2(K)$*

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{-y_0}{x_0 y_1 - x_1 y_0} & \frac{x_0}{x_0 y_1 - x_1 y_0} \\ \frac{y_1}{x_0 y_1 - x_1 y_0} & \frac{-x_1}{x_0 y_1 - x_1 y_0} \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

maps the vector (x_0, y_0) to $(0, 1)$ and the vector (x_1, y_1) to $(1, 0)$. For any index k , if $(\bar{x}_k, \bar{y}_k)^t = A(x_k, y_k)^t$, then for every indexes $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$, $i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ the following identities are verified

$$\bar{x}_j \bar{y}_{j+i} - \bar{x}_{j+i} \bar{y}_j = -C_i u_{j,j+i}, \quad (11)$$

where $u_{j,j+i}$ is the S -unit defined in part 1. Furthermore for every index $k > 1$

$$(\bar{x}_k, \bar{y}_k) = (C_k, -C_{k-1} u_{1,k}). \quad (12)$$

3. if i, j are coprime integers, then

$$\min\{\delta_p(P_0, P_i), \delta_p(P_0, P_j)\} = \delta_p(P_0, P_1) \quad (13)$$

and

$$\min\{v_p(C_i), v_p(C_j)\} = 0 \quad (14)$$

for every prime ideal $p \notin S$.

Proof. 1. Since the p -adic distance satisfies the following triangle inequality [12, Proposition 5.1]:

$$\delta_p(P, T) \geq \min\{\delta_p(P, Q), \delta_p(Q, T)\} \quad \text{for every } P, Q, T \in \mathbb{P}_1(K),$$

it follows that

$$\delta_p(P_j, P_{j+i}) \geq \min\{\delta_p(P_j, P_{j+1}), \dots, \delta_p(P_{j+i-1}, P_{j+i})\} = \delta_p(P_0, P_1).$$

for any index i, j . Thus, by the choice of coprime homogeneous coordinates for every points of $\mathbb{P}_1(K)$ and part (a) of Proposition 3 we have that $v_p(x_0y_i - x_iy_0) \geq v_p(x_0y_1 - x_1y_0)$, so (8) is proved. The identity (9) follows from (7) and (8).

2. Let A be the matrix defined in (10). We have that $A(x_0, y_0)^t = (0, 1)^t$ and $A(x_1, y_1)^t = (1, 0)^t$. Putting $(\bar{x}_k, \bar{y}_k)^t = A(x_k, y_k)^t$ for every index $k > 1$, the Equation (9) implies that for every indexes $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}, i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{n}$

$$\bar{x}_j \bar{y}_{j+i} - \bar{x}_{j+i} \bar{y}_j = -\frac{x_j y_{j+i} - x_{j+i} y_j}{x_0 y_1 - x_1 y_0} = -C_i u_{j,j+i}, \quad (15)$$

since $\det(A) = -(x_0 y_1 - x_1 y_0)^{-1}$, which proves (11).

Considering (15) with $j = 0, i = k$ and $j = 1, k = i + 1$ we prove (12).

3. There exist $c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $ci + dj = 1$. By part 1, the triangle inequality and Proposition 3 it is verified that

$$\delta_p(P_0, P_1) \leq \min\{\delta_p(P_0, P_{ci}), \delta_p(P_0, P_{-dj})\} \leq \delta_p(P_{ci}, P_{-dj}) = \delta_p(P_0, P_1)$$

and

$$\delta_p(P_0, P_i) \leq \delta_p(P_0, P_{ci}) ; \delta_p(P_0, P_j) \leq \delta_p(P_0, P_{dj})$$

so (13) follows .

Now suppose that $\delta_p(P_0, P_i) = \delta_p(P_0, P_1)$,

$$\delta_p(P_0, P_i) = v_p(x_0 y_i - x_i y_0) = v_p(C_i) + v_p(x_0 y_1 - x_1 y_0) = v_p(C_i) + \delta_p(P_0, P_1)$$

therefore we have that $v_p(C_i) = 0$ which proves (14). $\square$

Lemma 3 states that, for any (S, n) -cycle $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ and for every couple of indexes $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}, i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{n}$, the ideal $\mathfrak{I}(P_0, P_1)$ divides the ideal $\mathfrak{I}(P_j, P_{j+i})$. The S -integer C_i generates the ideal $\mathfrak{I}(P_0, P_i) \cdot \mathfrak{I}(P_0, P_1)^{-1}$. Moreover if i, j are coprime, then the greatest common divisor of $\mathfrak{I}(P_0, P_i)$ and $\mathfrak{I}(P_0, P_j)$ is $\mathfrak{I}(P_0, P_1)$.

Lemma 4. *Let $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ be a (S, n) -cycle and let $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$; then*

$$L_{i,j} := \frac{x_0 y_{i,j} - x_{i,j} y_0}{x_0 y_j - x_j y_0} \in R_S. \quad (16)$$

Moreover, let i, j be fixed coprime integers. If for every (S, n) -cycle the set of principal ideals generated by the possible values of $L_{i,j}$ is finite, then also the set of principal ideals generated by possible values of C_i is finite, where C_i is the S -integer defined in (8).

Proof. Let $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ be a cycle for a rational map Φ . In order to prove the first part we simply apply Lemma 3 to the cycle $(P_0, P_j, P_{2j}, \dots)$, relative to rational map Φ^j .

Now suppose that $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ are coprime. By (16) and (8)

$$x_0 y_{i,j} - x_{i,j} y_0 = L_{i,j} C_j (x_0 y_1 - x_1 y_0)$$

and

$$x_0 y_{i,j} - x_{i,j} y_0 = L_{j,i} C_i (x_0 y_1 - x_1 y_0),$$

therefore it follows that $L_{i,j} C_j = L_{j,i} C_i$.

From (14) in Lemma 3 we deduce that $v_p(C_i) \leq v_p(L_{i,j})$, for every $p \notin S$, so the finiteness of principal ideals generated by the possible values of $L_{i,j}$ gives the finiteness of principal ideals generated by the possible values of C_i . $\square$

In the next proofs we will frequently use the fact that S -unit equations of the type

$$a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + \dots + a_n x_n = 1, \quad (17)$$

where $a_i \in K^*$, have only a finite number of non-degenerate solutions

$$(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in (R_S^*)^n.$$

A solution is called non-degenerate if no subsum vanishes (i.e. $\sum_{i \in I} a_i x_i \neq 0$ for every nonempty subset $I \subsetneq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$).

In other words, the equation $X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_n = 1$ has only a finite number of

non-degenerate solutions $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in K^n$ with $v_p(X_i)$ fixed for every index i and for every $p \notin S$. Actually we shall use this result only for $n = 2$ and $n = 3$.

This equation has been widely studied in the literature. For $n = 2$, the finiteness of solutions of equation (17) was proved by C.L. Siegel in a particular case. Later K. Mahler studied the case $K = \mathbb{Q}$ and generic finite set S . In 1960 S. Lang extended Mahler's result to arbitrary fields K of characteristic 0 and solutions in any group $\Gamma \subset K^*$ of finite rank. A. Baker obtained effective results using his bound for linear forms in logarithms. J.-H. Evertse [4], studying the case where K is a number field of degree d over $\mathbb{Q}$, found that the set of solutions has cardinality $\leq 3 \cdot 7^{d+2s}$. This upper bound depends only on $s = \#S$ and $d = [K : \mathbb{Q}]$. Note that S includes all archimedean places of K , hence $s \geq d/2$. In this way we obtain the upper bound $3 \cdot 7^{4s}$ depending only on s .

For general $n > 2$, A. J. van der Poorten and H. P. Schlickewei in [17] and J. H. Evertse in [5] showed that the set of solutions is finite (non effective results). The best quantitative result is due to J. H. Evertse [7], who found the upper bound 2^{35n^4s} , depending only on s and n , for the cardinality of the set of solutions.

Using in the proof of Theorem 1 the bounds found by Evertse, we could obtain a quantitative result, depending explicitly on the cardinality of S and the class number of R_S .

Lemma 5. *Let $D, E \in K^*$ be fixed. Given the equation*

$$y^2 = Du + Ev, \quad (18)$$

the set

$$\left\{ [u : v : y^2] \in \mathbb{P}_2(K) \mid (u, v, y) \in R_S^* \times R_S^* \times R_S \text{ is a solution of (18)} \right\}$$

is finite and depends only on S , D and E . In particular the subset of R_S^ defined by*

$$\left\{ \frac{u}{v} \mid u, v \in R_S^* \text{ satisfy (18) for a suitable } y \in R_S \right\} \quad (19)$$

is finite and depends only on S , D and E . The same assertion is valid for the set of principal ideals of R_S defined by

$$\{yR_S \mid y \text{ satisfies (18) for suitable } u, v \in R_S^*\}. \quad (20)$$

Moreover the finiteness of the last set is valid also in the case $DE = 0$.

Proof. Since R_S^* has finite rank, there exists a finite set $W \subset R_S^*$, depending only on S , such that for every $u \in R_S^*$ there exist $\bar{u} \in R_S^*$ and $w \in W$ such that $u = w\bar{u}^6$. Let y be an integer which satisfies (18) for suitable $u, v \in R_S^*$; then there exist $\bar{u}, \bar{v} \in R_S^*$ and $w_1, w_2 \in W$ such that $y^2 = Dw_1\bar{u}^6 + Dw_2\bar{v}^6$. Therefore, we deduce that $(\bar{u}^2/\bar{v}^2, y/\bar{v}^3)$ is an S -integral point on the elliptic curve defined by the equation $Y^2 = Dw_1X^3 + Dw_2$. By the finiteness of S -integral points of elliptic curve (Siegel's Theorem, see for example [16, Chapter 7]) and finiteness of the set W we deduce that

$$\frac{y^2}{v} = \frac{1}{w_2} \left(\frac{y}{v^3} \right)^2 \text{ and } \frac{u}{v} = \frac{w_1}{w_2} \left(\frac{\bar{u}^2}{\bar{v}^2} \right)^3 \quad (21)$$

can assume only a finite number of values depending only on S . If $DE = 0$, e.g. $E = 0$, then it is trivial that $y^2 R_S = DR_S$. This concludes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 6. *Let $D, E \in K$ be fixed. Given the equation*

$$y^2 = D^2u^2 + DuEv + E^2v^2, \quad (22)$$

the set of ideals of R_S defined by

$$\{yR_S \mid (u, v, y) \in R_S^* \times R_S^* \times R_S \text{ is a solution of (22)}\}$$

is finite and depends only on S, D and E .

Proof. If $DE = 0$ the lemma is trivial.

Let $DE \neq 0$. We can suppose that D and E are integers. If they are not, we can choose an integer F , depending only on D and E , such that $FD, FE \in R_S$ and replace y^2 with F^2y^2 in (22).

If $(u, v, y) \in R_S^* \times R_S^* \times R_S$ is a solution of (22) then

$$y^2 = D^2u^2 + DuEv + E^2v^2 = (Du - \zeta Ev)(Du - \bar{\zeta} Ev),$$

where ζ and $\bar{\zeta}$ are the primitive third roots of unity. The elements $(Du - \zeta Ev)$ and $(Du - \bar{\zeta} Ev)$ of the extension $K(\zeta)/K$ are integers with the property that

$$(Du - \zeta Ev) - (Du - \bar{\zeta} Ev) = (\bar{\zeta} - \zeta)Ev.$$

Let T be the ring of algebraic integers of $K(\zeta)$ and let $\bar{S}$ be the finite set defined by all places of $K(\zeta)$ which lie over any place of K included in S . We can enlarge $\bar{S}$ to a finite set of places such that $T_{\bar{S}}$ is a unique factorization domain and such that $(\bar{\zeta} - \zeta)E \in T_{\bar{S}}^*$. The $T_{\bar{S}}$ -integers $(Du - \zeta Ev)$ and $(Du - \bar{\zeta} Ev)$ are coprime

and therefore, after multiplication by a unit, are squares in $T_{\bar{S}}$ and so they can be expressed in the form $w\bar{y}^2$ with $w \in T_{\bar{S}}^*$ and $\bar{y} \in T_{\bar{S}}$. Applying the last lemma to the equation $\bar{y}^2 = Du/w - \zeta Ev/w$ we easily deduce that there exists a finite set $\mathcal{U}$, depending only on $T_{\bar{S}}$, such that for every $u, v \in T_{\bar{S}}^*$ which satisfy (22) we have that $u/v \in \mathcal{U}$.

Since $R_S^* \subset T_{\bar{S}}^*$ the last statement is true also when we consider $u, v \in R_S^*$ and the conclusion follows. $\square$

Lemma 7. *Let $n \geq 3$ and C_2 be the integer defined in (8) of Lemma 3 and associated to a (S, n) -cycle. The set of principal ideals of R_S*

$$\{C_2 R_S \mid (P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1}) \text{ is a } (S, n)\text{-cycle}\}$$

is finite and depends only on S and K .

Proof. We use the notation of Lemma 3. Let $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ be a (S, n) -cycle.

Let us consider first the case that n is an odd number. By Proposition 3-(b) it follows that $\delta_p(P_0, P_1)$ and $\delta_p(P_0, P_2)$ are equal for every (S, n) -cycle and for every $p \notin S$; hence $v_p(x_0 y_2 - x_2 y_0) = v_p(x_0 y_1 - x_1 y_0)$, so from (8) we deduce that $C_2 = 1$. This case is proved.

By Lemma 3-Part 2, any (S, n) -cycle is mapped by the automorphism defined in (10) to the following ordered n -tuple of vectors of K^2

$$(0, 1); (1, 0); \dots; (C_i, -C_{i-1}u_{1,i}); \dots; (C_{n-1}, -C_{n-2}u_{1,n}).$$

Let $n \geq 4$ be an even number. Suppose first that $3 \nmid n$. By Proposition 3-(b) we have that $\delta_p(P_0, P_3) = \delta_p(P_0, P_1)$, therefore we deduce that $C_3 = 1$. By the identity (11) of Lemma 3 applied with $i = 1, j = 2$ and considering $C_1 = 1$ follows that $-C_2^2 u_{1,3} + u_{1,2} = -u_{2,3}$; thus we obtain that C_2 satisfies

$$C_2^2 = \frac{u_{1,2}}{u_{1,3}} + \frac{u_{2,3}}{u_{1,3}}.$$

Lemma 5, applied with $u_{1,2}/u_{1,3} = u, u_{2,3}/u_{1,3} = v$ and $C_2 = y$, proves this case.

Suppose now $n = 2 \cdot 3^k \cdot m$ with $m > 1$ and $3 \nmid m$. For every $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$, the n -tuple $(P_0, P_{3^k}, \dots, P_{(2m-1)3^k})$ is a $(S, 2m)$ -cycle and $2m \geq 4$ is coprime with 3. Let

$$L_{2,3^k} = \frac{x_0 y_{2 \cdot 3^k} - x_{2 \cdot 3^k} y_0}{x_0 y_{3^k} - x_{3^k} y_0}.$$

Applying to the above cycle the reasoning used in the previous case we obtain that, varying the possible (S, n) -cycle, the set of principal ideals of R_S generated by $L_{2,3^k}$ is finite. Now we simply apply Lemma 4 with $i = 2$ and $j = 3^k$.

The last case is $n = 2 \cdot 3^k$. We first reduce to the case $k = 1$. If $k > 1$ we consider the cycle $(P_0, P_{3^{k-1}}, \dots, P_{5 \cdot 3^{k-1}})$ which has length 6 and if the lemma holds in the case $n = 6$, then one has the finiteness of ideals generated by $L_{2,3^k}$. Therefore, by Lemma 4 applied with $i = 2$ and $j = 3^k$, this case is proved. Now we suppose that $n = 6$. By Lemma 3-Part 2, any cycle $(P_0, P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4, P_5)$, by the matrix defined in (10), is sent to the following ordered 6-tuple of vector of K^2

$$(0, 1); (1, 0); (C_2, -u_{1,2}); (C_3, -C_2u_{1,3}); (C_4, -C_3u_{1,4}); (C_5, -C_4u_{1,5})$$

with $u_{1,i} \in R_S^*$ for every $i \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$.

By Lemma 2 the identities $C_4 = C_2u_{0,4}$ and $C_5 = u_{0,5}$ hold for suitable $u_{0,4}, u_{0,5} \in R_S^*$. We rewrite the above 6-tuple as

$$(0, 1); (1, 0); (C_2, -u_{1,2}); (C_3, -C_2u_{1,3}); (C_2u_{0,4}, -C_3u_{1,4}); (u_{0,5}, -C_2u_{0,4}u_{1,5})$$

Imposing the identity (11) of Lemma 3 (after simple simplification) we obtain that C_2, C_3 satisfy the following system of equations:

$$\begin{cases} C_3u_{1,4} - u_{1,2}u_{0,4} = u_{2,4} & (a) \\ C_2^2u_{0,4}u_{1,5} - u_{1,2}u_{0,5} = C_3u_{2,5} & (b) \\ C_2^2u_{0,4}^2u_{1,5} - C_3u_{1,4}u_{0,5} = u_{4,5} & (c) \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

The equation (a) is obtained from (11) with $j = 2$ and $i = 2$, (b) with $j = 2$ and $i = 3$, (c) with $j = 4$ and $i = 1$. From (a) it follows that

$$C_3 = u_{1,2}u_{0,4}u_{1,4}^{-1} + u_{2,4}u_{1,4}^{-1}. \quad (24)$$

Now multiplying (b) by $-u_{0,4}$ and adding (c) we obtain

$$u_{0,4}u_{1,2}u_{0,5} + C_3u_{2,5}u_{0,4} - C_3u_{1,4}u_{0,5} = u_{4,5},$$

replacing C_3 with the right term of (24) in this last identity we obtain the following S-unit equation:

$$\frac{u_{1,2}u_{0,4}^2u_{2,5}}{u_{4,5}u_{1,4}} + \frac{u_{2,4}u_{0,4}u_{2,5}}{u_{4,5}u_{1,4}} - \frac{u_{2,4}u_{0,5}}{u_{4,5}} = 1 \quad (25)$$

Suppose that the equation (25) does not admit vanishing subsums. By the S-units Theorem, there exist only finitely many possible values for the ratios

$$\frac{u_{1,2}u_{0,4}^2u_{2,5}}{u_{4,5}u_{1,4}}; \frac{u_{2,4}u_{0,4}u_{2,5}}{u_{4,5}u_{1,4}}; \frac{u_{2,4}u_{0,5}}{u_{4,5}}.$$

From (24) it follows that

$$C_3 = \frac{u_{4,5}}{u_{0,4}u_{2,5}} \left(\frac{u_{1,2}u_{0,4}^2u_{2,5}}{u_{4,5}u_{1,4}} + \frac{u_{2,4}u_{0,4}u_{2,5}}{u_{4,5}u_{1,4}} \right) \quad (26)$$

therefore the set of principal ideals of R_S generated by C_3 is finite. By the above equation (b) and a suitable application to Lemma 5, also the set of ideals generated by C_2 is finite.

Suppose that in (25)

$$\frac{u_{1,2}u_{0,4}^2u_{2,5}}{u_{4,5}u_{1,4}} + \frac{u_{2,4}u_{0,4}u_{2,5}}{u_{4,5}u_{1,4}} = 0.$$

In this case, by (26), we have that $C_3 = 0$; this situation contradicts $n = 6$.

Suppose that in (25)

$$\frac{u_{1,2}u_{0,4}^2u_{2,5}}{u_{4,5}u_{1,4}} - \frac{u_{2,4}u_{0,5}}{u_{4,5}} = 0;$$

which is equivalent to

$$\frac{u_{2,4}u_{0,4}u_{2,5}}{u_{4,5}u_{1,4}} = 1.$$

From these last two identities it follows that

$$u_{1,2}u_{0,4}u_{0,5} = \frac{u_{2,4}^2u_{0,5}^2}{u_{4,5}}. \quad (27)$$

Now multiplying (a) by $u_{0,5}$ and adding (c) we obtain

$$C_2^2 = \frac{1}{u_{0,4}^2u_{1,5}}(u_{1,2}u_{0,4}u_{0,5} + u_{2,4}u_{0,5} + u_{4,5}) \quad (28)$$

Replacing $u_{1,2}u_{0,4}u_{0,5}$ in (28) with the right term of (27) we obtain

$$C_2^2 = \frac{1}{u_{0,4}^2u_{1,5}u_{4,5}}(u_{2,4}^2u_{0,5}^2 + u_{2,4}u_{0,5}u_{4,5} + u_{4,5}^2);$$

so applying in the suitable way Lemma 6 we obtain the finiteness of the set of principal ideal of R_S generated by C_2 . At last we consider the case

$$\frac{u_{2,4}u_{0,4}u_{2,5}}{u_{4,5}u_{1,4}} - \frac{u_{2,4}u_{0,5}}{u_{4,5}} = 0 \quad (29)$$

which is equivalent to

$$\frac{u_{1,2}u_{0,4}^2u_{2,5}}{u_{4,5}u_{1,4}} = 1$$

as well as

$$\frac{u_{0,4}u_{2,5}}{u_{4,5}u_{1,4}} = \frac{1}{u_{1,2}u_{0,4}}. \quad (30)$$

Replacing in (29) $(u_{0,4}u_{2,5})/(u_{4,5}u_{1,4})$ with the right term of (30) we obtain

$$\frac{u_{2,4}}{u_{1,2}u_{0,4}} - \frac{u_{2,4}u_{0,5}}{u_{4,5}} = 0$$

which is equivalent to $u_{1,2}u_{0,4}u_{0,5} = u_{4,5}$. From this last identity and (28) we obtain

$$C_2^2 = \frac{1}{u_{0,4}^2u_{1,5}}(u_{2,4}u_{0,5} + 2u_{4,5}).$$

By Lemma 5 we have the finiteness of the set of principal ideal of R_S generated by C_2 . This last case concludes the proof. $\square$

Corollary 3. *For every $l \in \mathbb{N}$, let C_{2^l} be the integer defined in Lemma 3 associated to a (S, n) -tuple. Then the set of principal ideals of R_S*

$$\{C_{2^l}R_S \mid (P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1}) \text{ is a } (S, n)\text{-cycle}\}$$

is finite and depends only on l, S and K .

Proof. We use the same notation of Lemma 3.

We prove the finiteness by induction on l . The case $l = 1$ was already proved in Lemma 7. Suppose that the statement is valid for $l - 1$. Let

$$L_{2,2^{l-1}} := \frac{x_0y_{2^l} - x_{2^l}y_0}{x_0y_{2^{l-1}} - x_{2^{l-1}}y_0}.$$

Applying Lemma 7 to the cycle $(P_0, P_{2^{l-1}}, P_{2^l}, \dots)$ we get the finiteness of the set of principal ideals generated by the possible values of $L_{2,2^{l-1}}$.

By Lemma 3

$$C_{2^l}(x_0y_1 - x_1y_0) = L_{2,2^{l-1}}C_{2^{l-1}}(x_0y_1 - x_1y_0).$$

Therefore, by inductive assumption on $C_{2^{l-1}}$, the conclusion follows. $\square$

Lemma 8. *Let C_3 be the integer defined in Lemma 3 associated to a (S, n) -tuple. The set of principal ideals of R_S*

$$\{C_3 R_S \mid (P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1}) \text{ is a } (S, n)\text{-cycle}\}$$

is finite and depends only on S and K .

Proof. We use the same notation of Lemma 3. The statement is trivial for $n < 4$. For $n = 4$ the lemma follows from Proposition 3, since n and 3 are coprime. Let $n > 4$. By Lemma 3, any (S, n) -cycle is sent by the automorphism defined in (10) to the following ordered n -tuple of vectors of K^2 :

$$(0, 1); (1, 0); (C_2, -u_{1,2}); (C_3, -C_2 u_{1,3}); (C_4, -C_3 u_{1,4}); \dots; (C_{n-1}, -C_{n-2} u_{1,n}).$$

Thus by the identity in (11), with $j = 3, i = 1$ it follows that

$$-C_3^2 u_{1,4} + C_4 C_2 u_{1,3} = u_{3,4}.$$

Note that by Corollary 3 we can choose a finite set $\mathcal{C}_2$ (the choice depends only on S) such that $C_2 = D_2 w_1$ and $C_4 = D_4 w_2$ with $D_2, D_4 \in \mathcal{C}_2$ and w_1, w_2 suitable S -units. Then C_3 satisfies one of the finitely many equations

$$C_3^2 = D_4 D_2 \frac{w_1 w_2 u_{1,3}}{u_{1,4}} - \frac{u_{3,4}}{u_{1,4}}. \quad (31)$$

Thus applying Lemma 5 to equation (31), with $w_1 w_2 u_{1,3}/u_{1,4} = u$, $u_{3,4}/u_{1,4} = v$ and $C_3 = y$, the lemma is proved. $\square$

Remark 1. Note that the sets of ideals defined in Lemma 5 and Lemma 6 have cardinality bounded by a constant depending only on S , the coefficient D, E and the field K (see the proof Theorem D.8.3. in [9] furthermore we can effectively determine these ideal sets). So the cardinalities of the sets of ideals defined in Lemma 7 and Lemma 8 are bounded by a constant depending only on S and K . $\square$

Recall that the cross-ratio of four distinct points P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4 of $\mathbb{P}_1(K)$ is

$$\varrho(P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4) = \frac{(x_1 y_3 - x_3 y_1)(x_2 y_4 - x_4 y_2)}{(x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1)(x_3 y_4 - x_4 y_3)}.$$

Proof. (Theorem 1) In this proof we will use the notation of Lemma 3.

By Lemma 3-part 1 it follows that, for every (S, n) -cycle $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$, the ideal $\mathfrak{I}_1 = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \notin S} \mathfrak{p}^{\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_0, P_1)}$ divides the ideal $\mathfrak{I}_i = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \notin S} \mathfrak{p}^{\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_0, P_i)}$, for any index i . This proves that every fractional ideal

$$\mathfrak{I}_i \mathfrak{I}_1^{-1} = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \notin S} \mathfrak{p}^{\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_0, P_i) - \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_0, P_1)}$$

is actually an integral ideal of R_S .

The theorem is equivalent to proving the finiteness of the possible values for $\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_0, P_i) - \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_0, P_1)$ for any (S, n) -cycle and $\mathfrak{p} \notin S$.

Let $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ be a (S, n) -cycle. The matrix A defined in (10) defines an element of $\text{PGL}_2(K)$ which maps the ordered n -tuple $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ to the n -tuple $(\bar{P}_0, \bar{P}_1, \dots, \bar{P}_{n-1})$. We represent the points of the last n -tuple with coordinates as defined in (12) such that the equations (11) are satisfied.

For every index i the following identities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\bar{P}_0, \bar{P}_i) &= v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\bar{x}_0 \bar{y}_i - \bar{x}_i \bar{y}_0) \\ &= v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0 y_i - x_i y_0) - v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_0 y_1 - x_1 y_0) \\ &= \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_0, P_i) - \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_0, P_1). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Therefore by (32) we get that for every $\mathfrak{p} \notin S$ the following statement is true:
the set

$$\Delta(\mathfrak{p}, i) := \{\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\bar{P}_0, \bar{P}_i) \mid (P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1}) \text{ is a } (S, n)\text{-cycle}\}$$

is finite depending only on S and K if and only if the set

$$\{\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_0, P_i) - \delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_0, P_1) \mid (P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1}) \text{ is a } (S, n)\text{-cycle}\}$$

is finite depending only on S and K .

Now we verify the finiteness of $\Delta(\mathfrak{p}, i)$ for every index i and for every $\mathfrak{p} \notin S$.

As remarked in the proof of Lemma 8 we can choose a set $\mathcal{C}_2$ (the choice depends only on S and K) such that for any possible value of C_2 we have that $C_2 = D_2 u$ with suitable $D_2 \in \mathcal{C}_2$ and $u \in R_S^*$.

By (12) the point $\bar{P}_2$ is $[C_2 : -u_{1,2}]$. Thus there exists a S -unit u such that the matrix

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} u & 0 \\ 0 & -u_{1,2} \end{pmatrix} \in \text{PGL}_2(R_S) \quad (33)$$

maps $\bar{P}_2$ to $[D_2 : 1]$ with $D_2 \in \mathcal{C}_2$. Let $\tilde{P}_i = U(\bar{P}_i) = [\tilde{x}_i : \tilde{y}_i]$ for every index $i \geq 3$; therefore, the automorphism U maps the n -tuple $(\bar{P}_0, \bar{P}_1, \dots, \bar{P}_{n-1})$ to

$$([0 : 1], [1 : 0], [D_2 : 1], \dots, [\tilde{x}_i : \tilde{y}_i], \dots, [\tilde{x}_{n-1} : \tilde{y}_{n-1}]), \quad (34)$$

where for every $p \notin S$ the p -adic distances are not changed.

It is clear that the theorem holds if $n < 4$. Otherwise by the properties of the cross-ratio

$$\varrho(\tilde{P}_0, \tilde{P}_1, \tilde{P}_2, \tilde{P}_3) + \varrho(\tilde{P}_0, \tilde{P}_1, \tilde{P}_3, \tilde{P}_2) = 1,$$

we have that

$$\frac{(\tilde{x}_0\tilde{y}_2 - \tilde{x}_2\tilde{y}_0)(\tilde{x}_1\tilde{y}_3 - \tilde{x}_3\tilde{y}_1)}{(\tilde{x}_0\tilde{y}_1 - \tilde{x}_1\tilde{y}_0)(\tilde{x}_2\tilde{y}_3 - \tilde{x}_3\tilde{y}_2)} - \frac{(\tilde{x}_0\tilde{y}_3 - \tilde{x}_3\tilde{y}_0)(\tilde{x}_1\tilde{y}_2 - \tilde{x}_2\tilde{y}_1)}{(\tilde{x}_0\tilde{y}_1 - \tilde{x}_1\tilde{y}_0)(\tilde{x}_2\tilde{y}_3 - \tilde{x}_3\tilde{y}_2)} = 1. \quad (35)$$

By Lemma 8 we can choose a set $\mathcal{C}_3$ (the choice depends only on S and K), such that for any possible value of C_3 we have that $C_3 = D_3w$ with suitable $D_3 \in \mathcal{C}_3$ and $w \in R_S^*$.

The following identities hold:

$$\tilde{y}_3 = \tilde{D}_2 v_{1,3} \quad (36)$$

$$\tilde{x}_3 = D_3 v_{0,3} \quad (37)$$

$$\tilde{x}_2\tilde{y}_3 - \tilde{x}_3\tilde{y}_2 = v_{2,3}, \quad (38)$$

for suitable $v_{1,3}, v_{0,3}, v_{2,3} \in R_S^*$, $\tilde{D}_2 \in \mathcal{C}_2$ and $D_3 \in \mathcal{C}_3$.

Let us rewrite equation (35) as the S -unit equation in $v_{1,3}/v_{2,3}, v_{0,3}/v_{2,3}$

$$-D_2\tilde{D}_2 \left(\frac{v_{1,3}}{v_{2,3}} \right) + D_3 \left(\frac{v_{0,3}}{v_{2,3}} \right) = 1. \quad (39)$$

Note that for any $D_2, \tilde{D}_2 \in \mathcal{C}_2$, $D_3 \in \mathcal{C}_3$ fixed, there are only finitely many solutions $(v_{1,3}/v_{2,3}, v_{0,3}/v_{2,3})$.

Hence, by (37) and (36)

$$[\tilde{x}_3 : \tilde{y}_3] = \left[D_3 \frac{v_{0,3}}{v_{2,3}} \frac{v_{2,3}}{v_{1,3}} : \tilde{D}_2 \right]$$

There are only finitely many equations of the type (39) since the sets $\mathcal{C}_2$ and $\mathcal{C}_3$ are finite; therefore the finiteness of the possible values of $\tilde{P}_3$ follows, for every (S, n) -cycle $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$. By the same argument, increasing by 1 each index in (35) we obtain that the set of possible points $\tilde{P}_i$ is finite, thus it follows the finiteness of the values of $\delta_p(\tilde{P}_0, \tilde{P}_i)$, for every index $i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$ and for every $p \notin S$.

The proof now follows simply applying Corollary B in [11], which states that if $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ is a (S, n) -cycle for rational map of degree ≥ 2 , then

$$n \leq [12(s+2) \log(5s+10)]^{4[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \leq [12(s+2) \log(5s+10)]^{8s}.$$

□

By Remark 1 the cardinality of the set $\mathbb{I}_S$ depends only on S and K .

3.2 Proofs in the general case.

Proof of Theorem 1. We deduce the general case of Theorem 1 from the particular case in which R_S is a P.I.D., treated in subsection 3.1. For every S such that R_S is not a P.I.D. there exist infinitely many prime ideals of R_S that are not principal (it is a direct consequence of unique factorization in prime ideals and the *Chinese Remainder Theorem*). Therefore if R_S is not a P.I.D., then there exist two disjoint finite sets S_1, S_2 of prime ideal such that $R_{S \cup S_1}$ and $R_{S \cup S_2}$ are P.I.D.. Let $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ be a cycle for a rational map of degree ≥ 2 with good reduction outside S . For every index $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, let $\mathfrak{I}_i$ be the ideals defined in (2). For every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ let $e_{\mathfrak{p}}$ be the exponent such that

$$\mathfrak{I}_i \mathfrak{I}_1^{-1} = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \notin S} \mathfrak{p}^{e_{\mathfrak{p}}}.$$

Applying Theorem 1 to $R_{S \cup S_1}$ we deduce that for every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \notin S \cup S_1$ (in particular for all $\mathfrak{p} \in S_2$) the value $e_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is non negative and bounded by a constant that depend only on S and K . Now, applying Theorem 1 to $R_{S \cup S_2}$, the same statement holds for all prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \in S_1$. In this way we have proved that there exist a constant c , which depends only on S and K , such that for every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \notin S$, $0 \leq e_{\mathfrak{p}} \leq c$. It is easy to see that for all prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$, but finitely many (they are independent from the choice of (S, n) -cycle), $e_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is zero. This concludes the proof. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 1. Fixing two consecutive points $P_0, P_1 \in \mathbb{P}_1(K)$ of a (S, n) -cycle we set the ideal $\mathfrak{I}_1$ defined by (2) and, by Theorem 1, the set of possible ideals $\mathfrak{I}_i$ is finite and fixed. Hence the choice of two consecutive points of a (S, n) -cycle $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ determines the finite set of possible values for $\delta_{\mathfrak{p}}(P_i, P_j)$, for any couple of points P_i, P_j . Applying the results of Birch and Merriman [3], with the same method used in the proof of Proposition 2, we prove the corollary. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 2. The proof of is contained in the proof of Theorem 1. Indeed $\mathcal{N}$ is the set of the n -tuples of type (34) which are obtained from any (S, n) -cycle $(P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{n-1})$ under the action of the matrix $U \cdot A \in \text{PGL}_2(K)$, where A and U are the matrices defined in (10) and (33), respectively. Since, for every n , the set of possible n -tuples of type (34) is finite (see the proof of Theorem 1) and n is bounded, then $\mathcal{N}$ is finite. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2. Let $K = \mathbb{Q}$ and $S = \{|\cdot|_\infty; |\cdot|_2\}$ so that $R_S = \mathbb{Z}[1/2]$. Let

$$\mathcal{T} := \{([u : u-1], [u-1 : -1], [1 : u]) \mid u \in R_S^*\}$$

We will prove that the infinite set $\mathcal{T}$ is formed by $(S, 3)$ -cycles for suitable rational maps of degree equal to 4 and that the set of primes defined by

$$\{p \mid \delta_p(P_0, P_1) > 0 \text{ for some } (P_0, P_1, P_2) \in \mathcal{T}\}$$

is infinite. In particular the set of possible ideals $\mathfrak{I}_1$ is infinite. This will prove automatically the extension of Theorem 2 to every number field K and every choice of finite set S containing all the archimedean places of K and the 2-adic ones.

For every point $P = [x : y] \in \mathbb{P}_1(\mathbb{Q})$ we can choose coprime S -integral coordinates (x, y) . By this choice of coordinates, for every prime p and for every couple of points $Q_1 = [x_1 : y_1]$, $Q_2 = [x_2 : y_2]$ of $\mathbb{P}_1(\mathbb{Q})$ the following identity holds

$$\delta_p(Q_1, Q_2) = v_p(x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1).$$

Hence we have the following identity between ideals

$$(x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1) = \prod_{p \text{ prime}} p^{\delta_p(Q_1, Q_2)}.$$

To simplify the notation, to any rational map $\phi: \mathbb{P}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_1$ defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ we associate, in the canonical way, the rational function $\phi(z) \in \mathbb{Q}(z)$ by taking the pole of z as the point at infinity $[1 : 0]$. In this way, a rational function $\phi(z) = N(z)/D(z)$ with $N, D \in \mathbb{Z}[z]$ coprime polynomials, has good reduction at a prime p if p does not divide the resultant of polynomials F, D and $\tilde{\phi}$, the rational function obtained from ϕ by reduction modulo p , has the same degree of ϕ . Writing $\mathbb{P}_1(\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{Q} \cup \{\infty\}$, we will shift from the homogeneous to the affine notation for points in $\mathbb{P}_1(\mathbb{Q})$ when necessary. So the point $[1 : 0]$ will correspond to ∞ and any other point $[x : y]$ will correspond to the rational number x/y .

Let $U(z) = (1 - z)^{-1}$. Then for every $x/y \in \mathbb{Q}$ it follows that

$$U\left(\frac{x}{y}\right) = \frac{y}{y-x}; \quad U^2\left(\frac{x}{y}\right) = \frac{y-x}{-x} \quad \text{and} \quad U^3\left(\frac{x}{y}\right) = \frac{x}{y}.$$

Indeed U is the automorphism of $\mathbb{P}_1(\mathbb{Q})$ associated to the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ of order 3 in $\text{PGL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$, so it has good reduction at any prime, since it is defined by a matrix

in $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. Note that every element of $\mathcal{T}$ is a cycle for U . Moreover U admits the following cycles:

$$0 \mapsto 1 \mapsto \infty \mapsto 0; \quad -1 \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \mapsto 2 \mapsto -1.$$

Define the degree three function $\Psi(z) \in \mathbb{Q}(z)$ by

$$\Psi(z) = \frac{(z+1)(2z-1)(z-2)}{2z(z-1)},$$

which has good reduction outside S and satisfies $\Psi = \Psi \circ U$.

For every S -integer u , let us define $P_0 = u/(u-1)$, $P_1 = U(u/(u-1)) = -(u-1)$ and $P_2 = U^2(u/(u-1)) = 1/u$. Since

$$\Psi(P_0) = \frac{-2u^3 + 3u^2 + 3u - 2}{2u^2 - 2u}$$

we have that the automorphism defined by

$$H(z) = \frac{(4u^2 - 4u)z - (-4u^3 + 6u^2 + 6u - 4)}{2uz + 4u^2 + u - 2}$$

verifies $H(\Psi(P_0)) = 0$ and it belongs to $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{Z}_S)$ if and only if $u \in R_S^*$. However the rational function

$$H \circ \Psi(z) = \frac{(2u^2 - 2u)z^3 + (2u^3 - 6u^2 + 2)z^2 + (-2u^3 + 6u - 2)z + (2u^2 - 2u)}{uz^3 + (2u^2 - u - 1)z^2 + (-2u^2 - 2u + 1)z + u}$$

verifies

$$H \circ \Psi(P_0) = H \circ \Psi(P_1) = H \circ \Psi(P_2) = 0. \quad (40)$$

Define $\Psi_1(z) = z + H \circ \Psi(z)$.

Lemma 9. *Let $\phi \in \mathbb{Q}(z)$ be a rational map with good reduction outside S such that $\phi(\infty) = \infty$, let $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ u & c \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{GL}_2(R_S)$ and put*

$$T(z) = \frac{az + b}{uz + c} \in \mathrm{PGL}_2(R_S).$$

Then the rational function $z + T \circ \phi(z)$ has degree $\deg(\phi) + 1$ and has good reduction outside S if and only if $u \in R_S^$.*

Proof. Let $\phi(z) = N(z)/D(z)$ where $N, D \in \mathbb{Z}[z]$ are polynomials with no common factor. Since $\phi(\infty) = \infty$ we have that $\deg(\phi) = \deg(N) > \deg(D)$ and since ϕ has good reduction outside S one has that the leading coefficient of N is a S -unit and N, D have no common factors modulo any prime $p \notin S$. Also the rational function

$$T \circ \phi(z) = \frac{aN(z) + bD(z)}{uN(z) + cD(z)}$$

has good reduction outside S ; therefore the polynomials $(aN(z) + bD(z))$, $(uN(z) + cD(z))$ have no common factor modulo any prime $p \notin S$ and have the same degree equal to $\deg(\phi)$; moreover the leading coefficient of $(uN(z) + cD(z))$ is a S -unit if and only if $u \in R_S^*$. Now it is immediate to see that the rational function

$$z + T \circ \phi(z) = \frac{(uN(z) + cD(z))z + aN(z) + bD(z)}{(uN(z) + cD(z))}$$

has degree equal to $\deg(\phi) + 1$ and has good reduction outside S if and only if $u \in R_S^*$. $\square$

Since $\Psi(\infty) = \infty$, we can apply Lemma 9 with $\phi = \Psi$ and $T = H$ so Ψ_1 has good reduction outside S if and only if $u \in R_S^*$. Moreover Ψ_1 has degree equal to 4 and by (40) follows that $\Psi_1(P_i) = P_i$ for every index $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Thus we get that (P_0, P_1, P_2) is a cycle for the rational map $\Phi = U \circ \Psi_1$ of degree 4 with good reduction outside S (if $u \in R_S^*$). The 3-cycle

$$(P_0; P_1; P_2) = ([u : u - 1]; [u - 1 : -1]; [1 : u]) \in \mathcal{T},$$

with $u = 2^n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ gives $\mathfrak{S}_1 = \mathfrak{S}_2 = (2^{2n} - 2^n + 1) \cdot \mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ proving Theorem 2. Note also that the set of prime divisors of $(2^{2n} - 2^n + 1)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is infinite. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2. $\square$

In the last proof we constructed a set of cycles of length 3. This is a consequence of the choice of the automorphism $U \in \text{PGL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ of order 3. However, for any n , with a suitable number field K and a suitable finite set S of places, it is possible to employ the same method as in the proof of Theorem 2 starting with an automorphism of $\text{PGL}_2(R_S)$ of order n . In this way it is possible to construct an infinite set of (S, n) -cycles which satisfies Theorem 2.

References

- [1] B R (2005) Preperiodic points of polynomials over global fields. ArXiv:math.NT/0506480
- [2] B F, S HP (1996) The equation $x + y = 1$ in finitely generated groups. Acta Arith **LXXVIII.2**: 189-199
- [3] B BJ, M JR (1972) Finiteness theorems for binary forms with given discriminant. Proc London Math Soc (3),**24**: 385-394
- [4] E JH, (1984) On equations in S-units and the Thue-Mahler equation. Invent Math **75**: 561-584
- [5] E JH (1984) On sums of S-units and linear recurrences. Compositio Math **53**,no 2: 225-244
- [6] E JH, G K (1991) Effective finiteness results for binary forms with given discriminant. Compositio Math **79**: 169-204
- [7] E JH (1995) The number of solutions of decomposable form equations. Invent Math **122**: 559-601
- [8] H -K F, N W (2000) Scarcity of finite polynomial orbits. Publ Math Debrecen **56/3-4**: 405-414
- [9] H M, S JH (2000) Diophantine Geometry An Introduction. Springer-Verlag, GTM **201**
- [10] M DA (1977) Number Fields. Springer-Verlag, Universitext
- [11] M P, S JH (1994) Rational Periodic Point of Rational Functions. Inter Math Res Notices **2**: 97-110
- [12] M P, S JH, (1995) Periodic points, multiplicities, and dynamical units. J Reine Angew Math **461**: 81-122
- [13] N W (1989) Polynomial cycles in algebraic number fields. Colloq Math **58**: 151-155
- [14] N W, P T (1997) Finite polynomial orbits in finitely generated domain. Monatsh. Math. **124**: 309-316

- [15] P T (1994) Polynomial cycles in certain local domains. *Acta Arith*
LXVI:1: 11-22
- [16] S JP (1989) Lectures on the Mordell-Weil Theorem. Friedr. Vieweg &
Sohn. Braunschweig
- [17] P AJ, S HP (1982) The growth condition for re-
currence sequences. Rep. No. 82-0041, Dept. Math., Macquarie Univ., North
Ryde, Australia

Jung Kyu CANCI
 Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica
 Università degli Studi di Udine
 via delle Scienze, 206, 33100 Udine (ITALY).
 E-mail: canci@dimi.uniud.it